

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12-14 and 16-18. Claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 17 are amended herein. Claims 9 and 16 are cancelled herein without prejudice. No new matter is presented. Claims 3, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 15 remain cancelled. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 10, 12-14, 17 and 18 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

- A. Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 12 and 16-18 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518 (Karaev), U.S. Patent No. 5,502,637 (Beaulieu) and U.S. Patent No. 6,834,312 (Edwards).

As mentioned above, claims 9 and 16 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

Karaev does not teach or suggest "accepting, by one terminal device directly connected to said central apparatus, as one set of data provision information, recipient information relating to a recipient who is authorized to receive said provision information, and a provision format of said provision information to be applied to said recipient, the provision format including a portable document format that is non-modifiable... and an original format which is modifiable..." (emphasis added), as recited in independent claim 1. See also independent claims 2, 10, 12 and 17.

The invention of claim 1 includes, "transmitting, by said one terminal to said central apparatus, the one set of data after accepting", and thus there is no risk that the information may be improperly modified and no possibility of dead copy of the information, i.e. due to an improper access, because the terminal device is "directly connected to the central device" without any intervening apparatus that can modify or copy the provision information improperly. Karaev does not teach these features of claim 1. See also claims 2, 10, 12 and 17.

Instead, the central repository server 2 in Karaev receives document profiles with information relating to each research document including authorization information specifying who is permitted to access each research document (see, col. 5, line 63 through col. 6, line 7, Figs. 1 and 5).

The Examiner acknowledges that Karaev does not state that the portable document format is converted from the provision information at the terminal device, but relies on Karaev as teaching the same. Further, as Beaulieu merely discusses author stations at brokers' locations for converting investment research into a portable document format, Beaulieu does not cure the

deficiencies of Karaev regarding the independent claims of the present application.

Beaulieu explicitly states, "author station 20 converts the PS format research from the analyst into a portable document format or .pdf file" (see, col. 4, line 60-62 and "a plurality of analysts 18, each of whom concentrates on..., and generates investment research concerning their area of concentration (emphasis added)" (see, col. 4., line 31-35). Meaning, a user inputs to the analyst 18 at least part of data which constitutes the "investment research" and that the at least part of data should be accepted by the analyst 18.

However, Beaulieu does not teach or suggest "a portable document format that is non-modifiable and is converted from said provision information at the terminal device..", as recited for example in claim 1.

Instead, the analyst 18 of Beaulieu just inputs the investment research in a modifiable PS format to the author station 20 as it is (see, col. 4, 11. 43 to 44). Contrary to "accepting, by one terminal device, as one set of data, provision information" (see claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 17), where the provision information has been already converted to the file in the non-modifiable format, with the input process of Beaulieu there is likely to be a risk that the investment research suffers from improper modification of the research, e. g. by unauthorized access.

Edwards does not add to the teachings of Karaev and Beaulieu with respect to the claimed invention. Instead, Edwards is limited to receiving a source file at a server which in turn provides an output file that may be accessed directly at server.

Further, even assuming arguendo that Beaulieu does disclose the features discussed by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the cited references. The Examiner stated that the combination of the references would be obvious because the combination satisfies the need for an Internet information delivery system that provides information only to users who are authorized to receive it.

However, Karaev teaches away from converting at a terminal apparatus because Karaev explicitly states, "In the representative embodiment, all reports received at the central site 1 are converted at the central site 1 into a format that can be read by the Acrobat Exchange program, available from Adobe Systems" (see, col. 3, lines 33-41).

MPEP §2143.01 states that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some reasoning that leads to a legal conclusion of obviousness. Therefore, as there is no requisite reasoning to combine the references cited by the Examiner, the Applicants respectfully request

the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejections.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

- B. Claims 4, 6, 13 and 14 as being unpatentable over various combinations of Karaev, Beaulieu, Edwards and U.S. Patent No. 6,717,938 (D'Angelo) and U.S. Patent No. 6,563,517 (Bhagwat).

Claims depending from the independent claims include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by the cited references. Accordingly, for at least the above-mention reasons, the dependent claims also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In particular, D'Angelo only discusses a user control of what information submitted to the LDAP server and Bhagwat is directed to re-encoding in an alternative encoding format to adjust response time in browsing (i.e., not based on recipient information).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF AMENDMENT:

Applicants respectfully request entry of amendments to the claims because the amendments were made to clarify features recited therein and do not introduce significant changes that would require a further search.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 02/26/2008

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500 ** Facsimile: (202) 434-1501